



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/705,235

11/12/2003

Munekatsu Shimada

50353-624

3529

7590 11/09/2007
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

SHEEHAN, JOHN P

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1793

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

11/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/705,235

Applicant(s)

SHIMADA ET AL.

Examiner

John P. Sheehan

Art Unit

1793

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John P. Sheehan.

(3) _____.

(2) Bernard P. Codd.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Arai et al. (US 2002/0153064).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed possibility of amending claim 9 or a dependent claim to add a process limitation regarding ball milling the alloy to a size smaller than or equal to the size of the hard magnetic phase so that the alloy powder exhibits anisotropy (support for example, paragraph 0033 of specification). Since the amendment finds support in the specification the Examiner had no objections. Mr. Codd explained that the claim limitation "a minimum distance between the soft phases is greater than or equal to 0.1" microns (100 nm) means that the hard magnetic phase has a size of at least 100 nm whereas Arai teaches a maximum hard magnetic grain size of 50 nm. Further, Examples 1 to 4 and Comparative Example 1 of the specification were discussed. These examples appear to show that when the soft magnetic phase is smaller than or equal to 1 micron and the minimum distance between soft magnetic phases is greater than or equal to 0.1 micron the alloy has an improved JS ratio which is a measure of the anisotropy of the alloy. The Examiner indicated that such arguments appear to put the case in condition for allowance but the Examiner would reserve final judgement until after the arguments have been submitted in writing for an in depth evaluation by the Examiner.